Note on "Diffusive quantum criticality in three-dimensional disordered Dirac semimetals"

Bitan Roy[1] and S. Das Sarma[1]

[1]*Condensed Matter Theory Center and Joint Quantum Institute, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742-4111, USA*

(Dated: February 11, 2016)

We correct erroneous conclusions from Ref. [1] regarding the values of various critical exponents, calculated to the two-loop order, and argue that ϵ-expansion near two spatial dimension, with $\epsilon = d - 2$ may not be reliable to address the critical properties of disorder driven Dirac semimetal-metal quantum phase transition in $d = 3$.

PACS numbers: 71.30.+h, 05.70.Jk, 11.10.Jj, 71.55.Ak

arXiv:1602.03470v1 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 10 Feb 2016

We here clarify some errors in our previous two-loop calculation for potential disorder driven Dirac semimetal (DSM)-compressible diffusive metal (CDM) quantum phase transition (QPT) in three spatial dimensions ($d = 3$), presented in Ref. [1]. In Ref. [1], we performed a two-loop analysis within the framework of an ϵ-expansion near $d = 2$ (the lower critical dimension for the problem), and reported that the correlation length exponent (CLE) (ν) is given by $\nu^{-1} = \epsilon - \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$ and dynamic scaling exponent (DSE) $z = 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} - \frac{3}{16}\epsilon^2 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$, where $\epsilon = d - 2$, near the DSM-CDM quantum critical point (QCP). Hence, for $d = 3$, we found $\nu \approx 1.14$ and $z \approx 1.31$ [1]. We now realized that the quoted values of these two exponents are incorrect, because we missed some relevant two-loop diagrams, which we correct here. But, more importantly we here question the validity of such an ϵ-expansion near $d = 2$ and argue that the ϵ-expansion may not be reliable for this problem.

We realized that instead of reevaluating the diagrams shown in Ref. [1], one can derive the flow equation for disorder coupling (Δ) by analyzing the Gross-Neveu (GN) model for a *discrete* chiral symmetry breaking mass condensation for which the flow equation of GN coupling (g) is known to three-loop order [2–5]. The Euclidean actions for these two theories are respectively

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}_D &= \int d^d\vec{x}d\tau \ \left(\bar{\Psi}_a \left[-i\partial_\tau\gamma_0 - iv\gamma_j\partial_j\right]\Psi_a\right)_\tau \\ &- \frac{\Delta}{2}\int d^d\vec{x}d\tau d\tau' \left(\bar{\Psi}_a\gamma_0\Psi_a\right)_\tau \left(\bar{\Psi}_b\gamma_0\Psi_b\right)_{\tau'}, \quad (1) \\ S_{GN} &= \int d^D\vec{x} \ \left[\bar{\Psi}\left(-i\gamma_\mu\partial_\mu\right)\Psi - g\left(\bar{\Psi}\Psi\right)^2\right], \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\Psi} = \Psi^\dagger\gamma_0$, a, b are replica indices. Due to fermion doubling in a lattice, we work with four dimensional γ matrices, satisfying the anticommutaiton relation $\{\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu\} = 2\delta_{\mu\nu}$. Critical behavior of S_{GN} and $\bar{S}_D$ can be studied performing ϵ-expansions respectively near two space-time and spatial dimensions. The infra-red flow equation for g to three-loop order reads as [2–5]

$$\beta_g = -\epsilon g + (n-2)g^2 - (n-2)g^3 - (n-2)(n-7)\frac{g^4}{4}, \quad (3)$$

where $\epsilon = D - 2$ with D as *space-time* dimensions, and n is the number of spinor components.

To derive the flow equation of (Δ) one can set the external frequency to zero, for which we establish a correspondence between diagramatic contributions for S_{GN} and $\bar{S}_D$. Contributions from relevant (i) one-loop (Fig. (i)-(iv) of Ref. [1]) and three-loop [see Fig. 1] diagrams are of opposite sign when the fermion vertex is accompanied by the matrix $\mathbb{1}_{4\times4}$ (GN theory) and γ_0 (potential disorder), (ii) two-loop diagrams that renormalize either GN (g) or disorder (Δ) coupling are of same sign for these two theories. Thus we can arrive at the flow equation for (Δ) to three-loop order from Eq. (3) by (i) first setting $n = 0$, since any contribution proportional to n involves fermion bubble that vanishes in the vanishing replica limit, and (ii) taking $-g = \Delta$, leading to

$$\beta_\Delta = -\epsilon\Delta + 2\Delta^2 + 2\Delta^3 + \frac{7}{2}\Delta^4, \quad (4)$$

where $\epsilon = d - 2$ and d represents the *spatial* dimensions. The exact location of the DSM-CDM QCP to from one-, two and three-loop order are respectively $\Delta^*_{(1)} = \epsilon/2$, $\Delta^*_{(2)} = \left(-1 + \sqrt{1+2\epsilon}\right)/2$ and

$$\Delta^*_{(3)} = -\frac{4}{21} + \sqrt{\frac{272}{441}}\sinh\left[\frac{1}{3}\sinh^{-1}\left[\frac{1323\epsilon + 440}{136\sqrt{7}}\right]\right].$$

When we expand the last two quantities in powers of ϵ the radius of convergence is $1/2$ and ≤ 0.35 (extracted numerically). Thus, setting $\epsilon = 1$ to extract the CLE in $d = 3$ is not a well defined procedure, since this expansion is not asymptotically convergent. Therefore, higher order terms from the ϵ-expansion about two spatial dimensions only produces unreliable results for $\epsilon = 1$ and this methodology of addressing the critical properties of DSM-CDM QPT in $d = 3$ needs to be abandoned.

Even if we choose to extract CLE from the powers series in terms of ϵ, to one-, two- and three-loop orders we respectively find $\nu^{-1}_{(1)} = \epsilon + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$,

$$\nu^{-1}_{(2)} = \epsilon + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3), \ \nu^{-1}_{(3)} = \epsilon + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} + \frac{3}{8}\epsilon^3 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4).$$



FIG. 1: Three loop diagrams contributing to the flow of Δ. We here do not show various combination of each class of diagrams, obtained by exchanging the disorder (dashed) lines. Notice three-loop diagram (f) and its various combinations, and two-loop diagrams (*viii*), (*ix*), (*xi*), (*xii*) from Ref. [1] do not renormalize Δ or g, since $\gamma_j\gamma_k\gamma_l \sim \epsilon_{jklm}\gamma_5\gamma_m$.

Therefore, in three spatial dimensions ($\epsilon = 1$), we obtain $\nu_{(1)} = 1$, $\nu_{(2)} \approx 0.67$ and $\nu_{(3)} \approx 0.53$. The fact that the inclusion of higher order corrections pushes the CLE close to the mean-field value ($\nu = 1/2$) is alarming, indicating failure of ϵ-expansion to capture the critical properties. It may be worthwhile to mention that the higher loop results for the CLE either do not ($\nu_{(3)}$) or barely ($\nu_{(2)}$) satisfy the Chayes-Chayes-Fisher-Spencer inequality ($\nu > 2/d$) [6], while the one-loop result ($\nu = 1$) satisfies the inequality, indicating that going beyond the one-loop order may not be meaningful in this problem.

Furthermore, one may wish to capture the asymptotic behavior of CLE using the *Padé approximation* [7, 8]. For $\nu_{(2)}^{-1}$ a Padé [1|1] approximation yields

$$\left[\nu_{(2)}^{-1}\right]^{[1|1]} = \frac{\epsilon}{1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}}. \tag{5}$$

Consequently, we obtain a mean-field value of CLE $\nu_{(2)} = 1/2$ for $\epsilon = 1$. On the other hand, to estimate the asymptotic behavior of $\nu_{(3)}^{-1}$ we can employ either Padé [2|1] or Padé [1|2] approximations, respectively yielding

$$\left[\nu_{(3)}^{-1}\right]^{[2|1]} = \frac{\epsilon - \frac{\epsilon^2}{4}}{1-\frac{3}{4}\epsilon}, \quad \left[\nu_{(3)}^{-1}\right]^{[1|2]} = \frac{\epsilon}{1-\frac{\epsilon}{2}-\frac{\epsilon^2}{8}}, \tag{6}$$

in turn giving $\nu_{(3)} \approx 0.33$ and 0.375 for $\epsilon = 1$, both being smaller than the mean-field value of CLE, strongly suggesting the inapplicability of ϵ-expansion for $d = 3$.

We do not discuss the corrections to the DSE (z) beyond the leading order in ϵ. Given that the radius of convergence of $\Delta^*_{(2,3)} \ll 1$, we conclude that higher order corrections to z are not meaningful when $\epsilon = 1$.

Therefore, within the ϵ-expansion scheme, where $\epsilon = d - 2$, only reliable values of the critical exponents near DSM-CDM QCP are $\nu = \epsilon^{-1}$ and $z = 1 + \epsilon/2$, respectively giving $\nu = 1$ and $z = 3/2$ in three spatial dimensions ($\epsilon = 1$), which one can also obtain from one-loop Wilsonian renormalization group analysis [9]. Going to higher loop calculations in ϵ for $d = 3$ can only produce progressively worse results for the critical exponents since the corresponding series is manifestly not convergent.

We point out that recent numerical calculations for the DSE (z) agree with the result from one-loop ϵ-expansion within numerical error bars [10–14], whereas the one-loop result for CLE (ν) reasonably agrees (within error bar) with the numerically calculated exponents in Ref. [10, 12–14], but disagrees with Ref. [11]. Whether the agreement between the numerical results and the one-loop calculation is merely a coincidence or implies something deep about the problem is unknown at this stage.

B. R. is thankful to John Gracey for valuable communication related to perturbative analysis of Gross-Neveu model. B. R. also thanks Igor Herbut and Pallab Goswami for useful discussion on this problem. During the preparation of the erratum, we became aware of a preprint [15] where a two-loop calculation has been carried out explicitly. Our flow equation in Eq. (4) to two-loop order agrees with the one reported in Ref. [15].

[1] B. Roy, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 241112(R) (2014).
[2] J. A. Gracey, Nucl. Phys. B **367**, 657 (1991).
[3] C. Luperini, and P. Rossi, Annals of Physics **212**, 371 (1991).
[4] N. A. Kivel, A. A. Stepanenko, and A. N. Vasil'ev, Nucl. Phys. B **424**, 619 (1994).
[5] M. Moshe, and J. Zinn-Justin, Physics Reports **385**, 69 (2003).
[6] J. T. Chayes, L. Chayes, D.?S. Fisher, and T. Spencer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 2999 (1986).
[7] G. A. Baker, P. Graves-Morris, *Padé Approximants*, (Cambridge University Press, 2nd ed., 1996).
[8] Since the power series of CLE does not display oscillatory behavior we cannot perform a Borel summation.
[9] P. Goswami, and S. Chakravarty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 196803 (2011).
[10] K. Kobayashi, T. Ohtsuki, K.-I. Imura, and I. F. Herbut, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 026602 (2014).
[11] B. Sbierski, E. J. Bergholtz, P. W. Brouwer, Phys. Rev. B **92**, 115145 (2015).
[12] J. Pixley, P. Goswami, and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 085103 (2016).
[13] S. Liu, T. Ohtsuki, R. Shindou, arxiv:1507.02381
[14] S. Bera, J. D. Sau, B. Roy, arxiv:1507.07551
[15] S. V. Syzranov, P. M. Ostrovsky, V. Gurarie, L. Radzihovsky, arXiv:1512.04130